The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) requires a State receiving funds under the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) program to provide assurances in four key areas of education reform: (a) achieving equity in teacher distribution, (b) improving collection and use of data, (c) standards and assessment, and (d) supporting struggling schools. For each area of reform, the ARRA prescribes specific actions that the State must assure it will implement. The U.S. Department of Education has established specific data and information collection and public reporting requirements that a State receiving funds under the SFSF program must meet with respect to the statutory assurances. This report provides information related to the SFSF assurances, is posted on the web site of the Montana Office of Public Instruction, and is updated annually.

Education Reform Area: Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

Table A provides information on the number and percentage of core academic subjects taught by highly qualified teachers and on the distribution of highly qualified teachers as defined by federal law. It also shows Montana's plans to survey school districts regarding the systems used by the districts to evaluate teachers and principals.

Table A. Indicators related to Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

Indicator	Description	MT Response
(a)(1)	The number and percentage of	Information is posted on
	core academic courses taught,	the MT OPI web site at
	in the highest and lowest	http://www.opi.mt.gov/R
	poverty schools, by teachers	eportCard/index.html.
	who are highly qualified	
	consistent with section 910(23)	
	of the Elementary and	
	Secondary Education Act of	
	1965, as amended	
(a) (2)	Whether the State's Teacher	Yes, Montana's Teacher
	Equity Plan (as part of the	Equity Plan is posted at
	Highly Qualified Teacher Plan)	http://opi.mt.gov/Accred/
	fully reflects the steps the State	HQT.html
	is currently taking to ensure	
	that students from low-income	
	families and minority students	
	are not taught at higher rates	
	than other students by	
	inexperienced, unqualified or	
	out-of-field teachers	

Table A. Continued

Indicator	Description	MT Response
Descriptor (a)(1)	The systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers and the use of the results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal	MT OPI will survey school districts in 2010 to collect this information.
(a)(3)	Whether the state systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion	MT OPI will survey school districts in 2010 to collect this information.
(a)(4)	If the district's teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level	MT OPI will survey school districts in 2010 to collect this information.
(a)(5)	If the district's teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, whether the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA	MT OPI will survey school districts in 2010 to collect this information.
Descriptor (a)(2)	The systems used to evaluate the performance of principals and the use of the results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal	MT OPI will survey school districts in 2010 to collect this information.
(a)(6)	Whether the state systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion	MT OPI will survey school districts in 2010 to collect this information.
(a)(7)	If the district's principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of principals rated at each performance rating or level	MT OPI will survey school districts in 2010 to collect this information.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) requires a State receiving funds under the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) program to provide assurances in four key areas of education reform: (a) achieving equity in teacher distribution, (b) improving collection and use of data, (c) standards and assessment, and (d) supporting struggling schools. For each area of reform, the ARRA prescribes specific actions that the State must assure it will implement. The U.S. Department of Education has established specific data and information collection and public reporting requirements that a State receiving funds under the SFSF program must meet with respect to the statutory assurances. This report provides information related to the SFSF assurances, is posted on the web site of the Montana Office of Public Instruction, and is updated annually.

Education Reform Area: Improving Collection and Use of Data

Table B provides information on 12 the elements of the America COMPETES Act that are included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system. It also provides information about whether the state provides reports to teachers about student growth on state assessments and individual teacher impact.

Table B. Indicators related to Improving Collection and Use of Data

Indicator	Description	MT Response
(b)(1)	Which of the 12 elements	Plan
	described in the America	
	COMPETES Act are included in	
	the State's statewide	
	longitudinal data systems	
(b) (2)	Whether the State provides	Plan
	student growth data on their	
	current students and the	
	students they taught in the	
	previous year to, at a	
	minimum, teachers of	
	reading/language arts and	
	mathematics in grades in which	
	the State administers	
	assessments in those subjects	
	in a manner that is timely and	
	informs instructional programs	
(b)(3)	Whether the State provides	Plan
	teachers of reading/language	
	arts and mathematics in grades	
	in which the State administers	
	assessments in those subjects	
	with reports of individual	
	teacher impact on student	
	achievement on those	
	assessments	

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) requires a State receiving funds under the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) program to provide assurances in four key areas of education reform: (a) achieving equity in teacher distribution, (b) improving collection and use of data, (c) standards and assessment, and (d) supporting struggling schools. For each area of reform, the ARRA prescribes specific actions that the State must assure it will implement. The U.S. Department of Education has established specific data and information collection and public reporting requirements that a State receiving funds under the SFSF program must meet with respect to the statutory assurances. This report provides information related to the SFSF assurances, is posted on the web site of the Montana Office of Public Instruction, and is updated annually.

Education Reform Area: Standards and Assessments

Table C provides information on the approval status of Montana's Comprehensive Assessment System (MontCAS) for the criterion-referenced tests (CRT and CRT-Alt). It also provides information about the number of students with disabilities and the number of limited English proficient students who are included in the reading/language arts and mathematics assessments. Montana's Report Card is posted at and includes information on student performance on the National Assessment of Education Progress. The table also provides information on the indicators related to high school graduation rates and college continuation.

Table C. Indicators related to Standards and Assessment

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Indicator	Description	MT Response
(c)(1)	The approval status, as	USED Approved –
	determined by the U.S.	Reading/Language Arts
	Department of Education, of	Mathematics
	the State's assessment system	
	with respect to	USED Pending – Science
	reading/language arts,	
	mathematics, and science	Posted on OPI web site at
	assessments	http://www.opi.mt.gov/PDF/Asses
		sment/MontCAS/MontCAS-
		Overview.pdf
(c) (2)	Whether the state has	Approved
	developed and implemented	
	valid and reliable alternate	
	assessments for students with	
	disabilities that are approved by	
	the U.S. Department of	
	Education	
(c)(3)	Whether the State's alternate	Alternate Achievement Standards
	assessment for students with	
	disabilities, if approved by the	
	Department, are based on	
	grade-level, modified or	
	alternate standards	

Education Reform Area: Standards and Assessments

Table C. Continued

Indicator	Description	MT Response
(c)(4)	Whether the State has completed in the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students with disabilities to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments	Plan
(c)(5)	The number and percentage of students with disabilities who are included in State reading/language arts and mathematics assessments	This information is posted on the OPI web site at http://www.opi.mt.gov/PDF/NCLB/Participation-rates-swd-lep.pdf
(c)(6)	Whether the State has completed in the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides limited English proficient students to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments	Plan
(c)(7)	Whether the State provides native language versions of State assessments for limited English proficient students that are approved by the U.S. Department of Education	No
(c)(8)	The number and percentage of limited English proficient students who are included in State reading/language arts and mathematics assessments	This information is posted on the OPI web site at http://www.opi.mt.gov/PDF/NCLB/Participation-rates-swd-lep.pdf
(c)(9)	Whether the State's annual Report Card contains the most recent available State reading and mathematics National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results	Yes

Table C. Continued

Indicator	Description	MT Response
(c)(10)	Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of	Plan
	these levels, by student subgroup (consistent	
	with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), the	
	number and percentage (including numerator	
	and denominator) of students who graduate from	
	high school using a four-year adjusted cohort	
	graduation rate as required by 34 CFR	
	200.19(b)(1)(i).	
(c) (11)	Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State,	Plan
	for each high school in the State and, at each of	
	these levels, by student subgroup (consistent	
	with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of	
	the students who graduate from high school	
	consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i), the	
	number and percentage (including numerator	
	and denominator) who enroll in an institution of	
	higher education (IHE) (as defined in section	
	101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as	
	amended (HEA)) within 16 months of receiving a	
() ((0)	regular high school diploma.	
(c)(12)	Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State,	Plan
	for each high school in the State and, at each of	
	these levels, by student subgroup (consistent	
	with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of	
	the students who graduate from high school	
	consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i) who enroll	
	in a public IHE (as defined in section 101(a) of the	
	HEA) in the State within 16 months of receiving a	
	regular high school diploma, the number and	
	percentage (including numerator and	
	denominator) who complete at least one year's	
	worth of college credit (applicable to a degree)	
	within two years of enrollment in the IHE	

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) requires a State receiving funds under the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) program to provide assurances in four key areas of education reform: (a) achieving equity in teacher distribution, (b) improving collection and use of data, (c) standards and assessment, and (d) supporting struggling schools. For each area of reform, the ARRA prescribes specific actions that the State must assure it will implement. The U.S. Department of Education has established specific data and information collection and public reporting requirements that a State receiving funds under the SFSF program must meet with respect to the statutory assurances. This report provides information related to the SFSF assurances, is posted on the web site of the Montana Office of Public Instruction, and is updated annually.

Education Reform Area: Supporting Struggling Schools

Table D provides information relating to Title I schools in improvement, corrective action or restructuring that have made progress on Montana's statewide student assessment. It also identifies those Title I schools which the Montana Office of Public Instruction has identified as "persistently lowest-achieving schools."

Table D. Indicators related to Support for Struggling Schools

Indicator	Description	MT Response
(d)(1)	The average statewide school	This information will be
	gain in the "all students"	posted on the MT OPI web
	category and the average	site by February 8, 2010.
	statewide school gain for each	
	student subgroup on the State	
	assessments in	
	reading/language arts; and	
	The number and percentage of	
	Title I schools in improvement,	
	corrective action, or	
	restructuring that have made	
	progress on State assessments	
	in reading/language arts, in the	
	last year.	
(d)(2)	The average statewide school	This information will be
	gain in the "all students"	posted on the MT OPI web
	category and the average	site by February 8, 2010.
	statewide school gain for each	
	student subgroup on the State	
	assessments in mathematics;	
	and	
	The number and percentage of	
	Title I schools in improvement,	
	corrective action, or	
	restructuring that have made	
	progress on State assessments	
	in mathematics, in the last	
	year.	

Table D . Continued

Indicator	Description	MT Response
Descriptor	The definition of "persistently lowest-achieving	This information will be posted on the MT
(d)(1)	schools" that the State uses to identify such	OPI web site by February 8, 2010.
	schools	
(d)(3)	The number and identity of schools that are Title I	This information will be posted on the MT
	schools in improvement, corrective action, or	OPI web site by February 8, 2010.
	restructuring that are identified as persistently	
	lowest-achieving schools	
(d)(4)	Of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that	0
	are Title I schools in improvement, corrective	
	action, or restructuring, the number and identity of	
	schools that have been turned around, restarted,	
	closed, or transformed in the last year	
(d)(5)	The number and identity of the schools that are	0
	secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not	
	receive, Title I funds that are identified as	
	persistently lowest-achieving schools	
(d)(6)	Of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that	Not applicable
	are secondary schools eligible for, but do not	
	receive Title I funds, the number and identity of	
	schools that have been turned around, restarted,	
	closed, or transformed in the last year	
(d)(7)	The number of charter schools that are permitted	No limit
	to operate under state law	
(d)(8)	The number of charter schools currently operating	0
(d)(9)	The number and percentage of charter schools	0
	that have made progress on State assessments in	
	reading/language arts in the last year	
(d)(10)	The number and percentage of charter schools	0
	that have made progress on State assessments in	
	mathematics in the last year	
(d)(11)	The number and identity of charter schools that	0
	have closed (including schools that were not	
	reauthorized to operate) within each of the last 5	
	years	

Table D . Continued

Indicator	Description	MT Response
(d)(12)	For each charter school that has closed (including a school that was not reauthorized to operate) within each of the last 5years, whether the closure of the school was for financial, enrollment, academic, or other reasons	Not applicable